UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,825	03/13/2006	Gabi Weizman	27128U	7406
20529 NATH & ASSO	7590 04/08/200 OCIATES	EXAMINER		
112 South West	Street	BOCKELMAN, MARK		
Alexandria, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3766	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/560,825	WEIZMAN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Mark W. Bockelman	3766			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 December</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	vn from consideration.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence of th	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3-10-2008.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 positively recites a blood vessel, which is a body part and in reciting such includes part of a human being as part of the invention. Such is not permitted. Applicant can change the language to make it an intended use such as "at least one balloon adapted to be placed alongside a portion of the blood vessel" to avoid the rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3766

Claims 1-2, 8-11, 12-13, 19-22, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Chiu USPN 5,429,584 alone or alternatively in view of Pacella et al USPN 6,045,496. Chiu teaches an implantable control console and inflation unit 10 and 54, heart rate sensing means 24, bladder 10 and flow director 54, a sleeve restrainer 16 and a balloon member 52 for compressing the aorta against the sleeve. Applicant's statements of intended use such as where the controller is adapted to be worn are given little to no patentable weight since they impart no meaningful structure and the controller is capable of being worn anywhere. While the sensor of Chiu is unspecified as to the type but stated as a heart rate sensor, because it is considered to detect electrocardiograph signals such as systole and diastole it is considered to meet applicant's claim language. Applicant does not require the sensor to detect electrical signals of the heart, only those signals that are represented on an electrocardiograph. However, in the event such claims are read more narrowly, to have used an ecg detector would have been obvious in view of Pacella.

Claims 3-4, 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu USPN 5,429,584 (alone or further in view of Pacella et al USPN 6,045,496) as applied above and further in view of Hakim USPN 3,675,656. To have provided the restrainer sleeve 16 of Chiu with a protrusion member of Hakim (element 36) for ensuring complete closure of the vessel would have been obvious.

Claims 7, 18, 23-24, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu USPN 5,429,584 alone or alternatively in view of Pacella et al USPN 6,045,496. The examiner takes official notice that using blood pressure for

Art Unit: 3766

detecting heart rate and for verifying an ecg are well known. To have included a blood pressure sensor in the Chiu heart rate sensor would have been obvious. Including a sheath attachment member to prevent the balloon member from falling out of the sleeve would have been obvious. To have used the compression member with other arteries such as the iliac to prevent back flow would have been obvious.

Page 4

Claims 5-6, 16-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu USPN 5,429,584 alone or alternatively in view of Pacella et al USPN 6,045,496, and further in view of Habib USPN 5,372,573.

Applicant differs in reciting multiple balloon compartments. Habib shows such an arrangement for squeezing vessels. To have included such the Chiu compressing device would have been an obvious substitution to complete the same task.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Page 5

Claims 1- 26 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-61 of U.S. Patent No. 6,984,201.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the current claims are merely broader in scope, eliminating patentable features.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark W. Bockelman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4941. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Layno can be reached on (571) 272 -4949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/560,825

Page 6

Art Unit: 3766

/Mark W Bockelman/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3766 March 31, 2008